



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

And wondrous chaste of life, yet lou'd of Knights and Lords.  
Full many Lords, and many Knights her loued.

V, xi, 13-14:

And with his mortal steel quite through the body strooke.  
Through all three bodies he him strooke attonce.

Other examples are I, iv, 2-3, 9-10; vii, 34-35; ix, 43-44; xi, 11-12; II, i, 20-21, 53-54; ii, 29-30; xi, 26-27; xii, 51-52; III (Introductory stanzas), 1-2; ii, 43-44; v, 25-26; 45-46; vii, 47-48; viii, 36-37; 39-40, 41-42; xi, 9-10, 10-11; xii, 28-29, 38-39; IV, v, 30-31; vi, 14-15; ix, 17-18; V, i, 6-7, 8-9; ix, 23-24; x, 3-4; VI, viii, 15-16; (?)x, 25-26; xii, 36-37.

Some interesting results appear when one counts the total number of instances of this use of repetition to connect stanzas in the first three books of the *Fairy Queen* and in the last three. I find forty-eight examples in Books I-III as against twenty-six in Books IV-VI. Book III has many more than any other, namely twenty-two—nearly as many as are found in the whole of the last three books. Book IV has thirteen, as many as are found in either Book I or Book II; Book V has only seven, and Book VI a bare half-dozen. The cantos on Mutability have only one inconspicuous and perhaps unintentional example. It looks as if Spenser made consciously increasing use of the artifice through Book III, and then gradually gave it up as he acquired the uncanny naturalness both of narrative and versification which is so remarkable in the fifth and sixth books.

TUCKER BROOKE.

*Yale University.*

## REVIEWS

*Manual de Pronunciación Española.* By T. NAVARRO TOMÁS.  
Madrid: Publicaciones de la "Revista de filología española,"  
1918.

This work appeared in the nick of time, and was hailed with enthusiasm by our Spanish "confrérie." It is now high time that at least an estimate were made as to its usefulness.

Some excellent features may be stated in the beginning. Mr. Navarro Tomás has a very good clear style, and where obscurities

occur they are rather of conception than of expression. The material is well organized. The form of presenting examples, barring a few exceptions, is very clear. The great abundance of phonetic texts is (in spite of the transcription used) an excellent feature.

The author has rendered a great service to his own countrymen in this contribution, putting within reach of all Spaniards proof of the existence of a phonetic problem for them. Mr. Navarro Tomás is one of the first Spaniards to come out frankly as an advocate of a multi-vowel system for Spanish. He has a good chapter on accent, where as a compiler he appears at his best. But the feature especially worthy of consideration is his chapter on intonation and the accompanying texts. This chapter deserves especial commendation as an essay in a field which has hitherto received scant attention, and in it we have his greatest contribution to phonetics.

The author professes to take as a norm of good pronunciation (1) that which is used in Castile in the conversation of cultivated persons. But, he says (2), "su uso, sin embargo, no se reduce á esta sola región, sino que, recomendada por las personas doctas, difundida por las escuelas y cultivada artísticamente en la escena, en la tribuna y en la cátedra, se extiende más o menos por las demás regiones de lengua española."

In our opinion, when the author takes as a basis the differing speeches of ten or twelve Castilian provinces, throwing out all provincialisms, as he says he does, and then admits as identical the pronunciation of a more or less considerable part of the rest of the Spanish-speaking world, he normalizes, idealizes, and de-localizes to such an extent that we have no longer a Castilian pronunciation, or any really definite or actual pronunciation. Such a pronunciation is an imaginary and theoretical synthesis which cannot form the basis for any scientific analysis of sounds.

The author maintains the unity of this Spanish pronunciation which he calls "correcta." He says that the different elements, chiefly provincial in origin, which form the intellectual classes in Madrid spontaneously adopt this pronunciation, and adds: "Esto hace, en efecto, que sea frecuente encontrar en Madrid asturianos, gallegos, aragoneses, catalanes y hasta andaluces y americanos—que son los más pertinaces en la conservación de su acento—tan

diestros en pronunciación correcta como los más castizos castellanos."

The writer begs to register extreme skepticism as to the frequency and as to the "chasteness" of such Castilian; for example, he is extremely well satisfied with his own pronunciation of English. He speaks neither with a nasal twang, nor with a Southern drawl, does not use cacuminal consonants, etc., but he does not believe that a phonetician worthy of the name would be deceived by his rather good imitation of, should one say "Londonese" or standard speech of southern England.

From a phonetic point of view, the unity of correct world-Spanish is like the unity of correct world-English speech, *imaginary*. Its existence can be affirmed only by allowing so great a "range" for a given sound (especially vowel) that a neophyte might recognize the lack of phonetic unity.

Mr. Navarro Tomás was born in La Roda in Albacete, in the extreme southeastern corner of New Castile. The writer is not familiar with the speech of this region, and further has no means of judging what influence the author's pronunciation has on his analyses; but whatever it be, the fact remains that he minimizes dialectical differences, and normalizes Castilian by a tendency toward a reduction to Spanish.

American teachers of Spanish are likely to overestimate the importance of a purely Castilian pronunciation as compared with a good Spanish pronunciation. But the reason is clear, namely, the desire to have the best model possible; and why not, if one has the choice, even if the American student rarely acquires as good an imitation as many provincial Spaniards.

On the other hand, the native teachers of Spanish (of whom an infinitesimal proportion are Castilian), as a matter of stock in trade and as a matter of amour propre, solidarity, and prestige, are unwilling to admit that they have not a first-class Castilian pronunciation. Hence they minimize the dialectical differences in Spanish.

The chief device of provincial Spaniards, especially teachers, who desire to escape from their native dialect is to speak Spanish with exaggerated correctness, adopting largely what is known as "el estilo de maestro." This speech is quite artificial, precise, affected, and presents a very exaggerated use of close vowels.

Neither this style nor an imitation of it can be classed as good Castilian.

However, at least so long as native teachers with one accord acclaim the beauties of Castilian pronunciation, the burden of proof will rest upon them to show that their speech is a sufficiently good imitation of Castilian to serve for all practical purposes. To do this effectively, they must really become acquainted with the chief differences. Else, in the long run the denial of their existence will prove "contraproducente." Moreover, here reference is not had to patent differences known even to the most uneducated Spaniards, namely such as *s* for *θ*, etc. For, if the teacher does not know more than the ignorant "layman" about Spanish pronunciation, with what authority can he speak?

The case as between Southern England and American English on the one hand, and as between Castilian and American or provincial Spanish, on the other hand, is similar in its broad general aspects. To mention only two capital parallel differences between American and provincial Spanish and American English on the one hand, and Castilian and standard south-of-England speech, on the other hand, we have in the first place the similar much more advanced development of the obscure or semi-obscure vowels in the former speeches in places where Southern English (of England) and Castilian, respectively, present a closer and more carefully articulated vowel.

As to Castilian and Spanish, the degree of obscuration of the vowel is quite important as bearing on vowel quality, not only as regards the syllables in which these semi-obscure vowels occur, but especially, in view of the great sensitiveness of Castilian vowels to metaphonic influences, as regards other syllables. This is likewise quite important in its direct effect on syllable division and consonantal liaison. In general, we notice in American Spanish a tendency to reduce the close vowels to a medium open vowel. A second great difference envisaged in the parallel drawn above is in intonation.

It is then in conclusion not only not "common," as Navarro Tomás says, "to find Galicians, Catalonians, and even Andalusians and Americans as skillful in the correct pronunciation as the most pure Castilians," but it is exceedingly rare. Is the American student or teacher willing to trust Mr. Navarro Tomás's ears if

he does not hear the differences both here and in the case of foreign sounds, as noted below?

Here we have the great weakness of many of the experimental phoneticians. They will not confine themselves to conclusions drawn from mechanical records, but insist on dogmatizing as to what they hear, when they have never spent the indispensable ten or twenty years training their ears to hear correctly.

Mr. Navarro Tomás's comparisons of Spanish vowels with those of English, French, and German show lack of familiarity with the vowel sounds of those languages. He says Spanish *e* sounds a little less close than the *e* in French *chanté*, German *fehlen*, English *pane*; open *e* sounds approximately like *e* in French *perte*, German *fett*, English *let*; medium *a* like *a* in French *part*, English *bath*, German *was*; close *o* less close than *o* in French *chose*, English *obey*, German *dose*; close *i* is generally less closed and less tense than the *i* in French *vie*, German *sieben*, English *be*, etc.

If a vowel is a little less close than the *o* (which is not a close *o*) in the English *əbei*, how much of an *o* is it, and how close? If the Spanish *e* is a little less close than the diphthong in the English *pane* (and *e* in German *fehlen* and French *chanté*), how much of an *e* is it, and how close? Mr. Navarro Tomás should accept these English, French, and German sounds as presented by Sweet, Jespersen, Viëtor, Passy, etc.

Mr. Navarro Tomás states very clearly his object, namely to avoid all subtleties, and present a simple and practical handbook on pronunciation (page 5). Especially in view of this object, we should say that among the many errors of judgment, and by no means the least, is his choice of a phonetic transcription unknown to most students, especially American students, whereas that of the International Phonetic Association is widely known. For a manual this is a serious defect.

Upon the publication of *La Phonétique castillane*<sup>1</sup> (a book of research), one reviewer threw up his hands in horror at sixteen oral vowels for Castilian. (*La Phon. cast.*, p. 21.)

But for the *i* and *u* sounds alone (including *j* and *w* semi-vowels, but excluding the consonant "j") Mr. Navarro Tomás gives in his simple, practical manual no less than ten sounds, one more for

<sup>1</sup> M. A. Colton, *La Phonétique castillane*, Paris, 1909.

*i* and *u* than for all other oral vowels combined, the total being nineteen oral vowels.

These *i* and *u* sounds exist, of course, in one way or another, and are discussed in *La Phonétique castillane* repeatedly, pp. 71, 172, 197 (*cf.* pp. 42, 67-70). But even in that book, where the author was not limited by Navarro Tomás's simple and practical purpose, these sounds are reduced in the table of vowels to about half Navarro Tomás's figure (excluding *j*, which serves in *La Phon. cast.* as both semi-vowel and consonant "*j*").

If the author had made out a vowel triangle, not only should we judge more clearly as to what shade he assigns to each of his vowels, but he himself might have been able to see the extraordinarily disproportionate development and importance he was assigning to the *i*'s and *u*'s as compared to the various *a*, *o*, *e*. On the other hand, he did not seem to see the similar disproportionate multiplicity of certain consonants in his table, p. 60.

Araujo presents a much better proportioned table of chief vowel sounds (*La Fonetika Kastellana*, p. 33; as this book is out of print, see *La Phonétique castillane*, p. 74, for a copy thereof), which he introduces as follows: "Resumiendo el precedente estudio en un cuadro sinóptico, tendremos que las vocales castellanas con sus variantes más caracterizadas, son las siguientes: A, *a*; *ö*, *è*, *e*, *ø*; *i*, *í*; *o*, *o*, *ø*; *ù*, *u*, *v*."

This list would be more acceptable if the *v* were omitted; but, as it is, Araujo stresses the common phonetic principle of the usual development of the *e*'s in languages. He says of *e*: "Este sonido es el más rico en matices, como en general de todas las lenguas, etc." Here then we find Navarro Tomás in direct contradiction with his long list of *i*'s and *u*'s as compared with the few *e*'s; hence, Araujo's table of most characteristic vowels would be better for a student's manual than that of Navarro Tomás, as the former places the emphasis in the right place instead of (1) presenting a multitude of hairsplitting varieties of *i* and *u*, and (2) presenting a system of obscure vowels far too developed and exaggerated for pedagogic use.

It is interesting to note that Wulff, in his *Chapitre de phonétique*, presents the following vowels (excluding a weak consonant *u*): 3 *a*'s; 6 *e*'s (including *oe*); 2 *i*'s; 2 *u*'s; 4 *o*'s; in all, seventeen oral vowels. It will be seen in *La Phon. cast.*, p. 21, that we have

given sixteen oral vowels. But this divergence is not significant, as we have there included the semiobscure *ě* (pp. 67-70), or *e*<sup>+</sup> in a category with other *e* sounds, largely for the sake of avoiding undue multiplicity of vowels in our table of principal sounds.

In Wulff's list (cited in *La Phon. cast.*, p. 87), notice the great number of *e*'s as compared to *i*'s and *u*'s. Arranged in order of numerousness according to Wulff in decreasing series, we have *e*, *o*, *a*, 6, 4, 3, and *i*, *u*, 2, 2. Mr. Navarro Tomás just reverses this order, assigning some ten shades to *i* and *u*, and three shades to each of the other vowels, *a*, *o*, *e*.

After the foregoing summary, a detailed consideration of the author's vowel analyses is unnecessary. He pays very little attention to the vowels, devoting, if we include examples but exclude long literary citations, about a dozen pages to them.

However, it may be profitable to consider further and more at length a few features of his group analyses, even at the risk of wearying the reader. If, in a "simple, practical" manual, the author gives ten varieties of *i*'s and *u*'s, more or less (or even six, for that matter), what analyses could be expected from him in a book of scientific research? To Mr. Navarro Tomás, these *i*'s and *u*'s represent not subtleties, but real and considerable differences of timbre. For he says: "Las modificaciones que suelen producirse por metafonía ó armonía de timbre entre las vocales de sílabas contiguas se reducen de ordinario en la pronunciación correcta, á leves y sùtiles matices, cuyo análisis puede sin perjuicio omitirse en la enseñanza práctica del idioma" (p. 36.)<sup>2</sup>

It is to be inferred, therefore, that the vertical distance, or jaw-tongue separation from palate, *i. e.*, the difference in quality between each of the ten *i*'s and *u*'s is much greater than is the case with the "sùtiles matices" of metaphony, else the author would have omitted them in a simple practical manual. Hence, in making out a vowel triangle for Navarro Tomás, one would be justified in allotting a normal or appropriate distance between these *i*'s and *u*'s. Let the reader try it and see how impossible such a triangle would be with so much space taken up by those vowels as to leave comparatively little for all *a*'s, *o*'s, *e*'s.

But our only other recourse is the other horn of the dilemma,

<sup>2</sup>The note, p. 36, although the only direct citation of *La Phon. cast.*, is erroneous, particularly as to "sin dejar de ser cerrada," etc.



namely, as will be shown according to Navarro Tomás's own analyses, that these ten *i*'s and *u*'s are infinitesimal vowel shades, which have no place, as given, either in a manual or anywhere else.

For close *i* and close *u*, respectively, the author gives "abertura de las mandibulas unos 4 mm. entre los incisivos"; for the close *e* and *o*, respectively, "abertura de las mandibulas, 6 mm."  $6 - 4 = 2$  mm. 2 mm. is the total distance between close *i* and close *e*. Then what mandibular separation should we expect as a range for all the *i*'s or *u*'s? Let that distance be "*n*," or shall we say 1 mm?, assuming the range is one-half the total distance. Throwing out the more consonantal variety of *i*, let us divide the total distance by 4 =  $n \div 4 = .25 n$  (or .25 mm?).

The author does not give the tongue palate separation; but if he did, the separation between each of these varieties would of necessity be either "*n*," letting  $n =$  normal distance, or .25 *n*. (or less); that is, these distances between *i* (or *u*) and the next shade of *i* would be either normal, with an extraordinary predominance of *i*'s and *u*'s for a vowel triangle, or else the distances would be infinitesimal and hairsplitting, especially in a manual, where practical simplicity is promised by the author.

But the latter of the two analyses, undoubtedly the correct one, is further rendered less tenable by his statement, previously made by predecessors, viz.: that Spanish close *i* is less close than that of French, German, etc. He should also state that Spanish open *i* is less open than that of English and German, instead of "suena aproximadamente como la *i* en ingl. *bit*, *think*; al. *mit*, *nicht*." Hence in reality there is less than the normal space, if we assume German, French, etc., as normal, for the four or five Spanish *i*'s. A placing of four or five *i*'s within this narrow space is inadmissible crowding.

Of the semi-vowel *i* he says: "se pronuncia aún algo más abierta que en los casos anteriores" (p. 39), etc. But if a semi-vowel (semi-consonant) is more open than its corresponding vowel, then such a statement would seem to be based on the peculiar conception that consonants are more open than vowels. A similar case is discussed in *La Phon. cast.*, p. 98 (Rambeau cites this in his review of *La Phon. cast.*, in *Die Neueren Sprachen*, xxi, 401-7).

The author divides semi-vowels into two classes, semi-vowels and semi-consonants. But his description, articles 48 and 67, is

merely that of an on-glide for the semi-vowels, and an off-glide for the semi-consonants. Such a method of classification, if applied to all vowels and all consonants, might readily double, if not triple, the number of sounds to be classified: *e. g.* (1) a *p* initial without on-glide, (2) a *p* medial with neither on-glide nor off-glide, (3) a *p* final without off-glide. The author is addicted to such methods of classification, presenting three *n*'s: *n* in *mano*; *n* in *onza*; *n* in *monte*; three *l*'s: *l* in *luna*; *l* in *alzar*; *l* in *falda*, etc., all of which is contrary to phonetic practice, and seems needlessly to multiply sounds and complicate classification.

In the matter of the semi-obscure vowels, the author exaggerates greatly, not only as to their analysis, but also especially as to their use. The five vowels *ɐ*; *o*; *u*; *ə*; *ɪ* exist in one way or another; they are mentioned by Araujo, and treated in *La Phon. cast.*, pp. 42, 68-71, 172, 197, etc. But it will be noted that in Araujo's table of chief vowels only one of these vowels is given, *viz.*: *ə*. Certainly in our judgment at the very most only two of them, *ɐ*, *ə*, could even by stretching a point be placed in a manual, or for that matter even in a table of normal vowels in general. The remaining vowels, *o*, *u*, *ɪ*, are not either sufficiently developed or sufficiently regular in appearance for such a classification in Castilian, however, it may be in Spanish.

Many of the rules for occurrence of a given vowel seem objectionable; *e. g.*, speaking of *e cerrada*, he says: "Hállase en sílaba abierta acentuada, en sílaba cerrada por *n*, *s*." This latter cannot be maintained in general. It is true, however, that in final syllables before *s*, *e* is more often close than elsewhere for reasons which are easily discernible.

As to the nasal vowels in general, he exaggerates their occurrence, saying: "Una vocal entre dos consonantes nasales resulta en general completamente nasalizada, ex. *mãno*," etc. This observation would be more true of a certain provincial Spanish, but can hardly be maintained in general of Castilian. In the one case of vowel plus *n* plus *f*, he minimizes concerning the fall of *n*.

The only reference noted in the *Manual* in regard to anything but conventional or orthographic syllable division is on page 129, where the author seems to accept in part the theories of *La Phon. cast.* He gives there the transcriptions *pas-sa*, *θes-sɐ*, etc. This may be noted also as somewhat contradictory to his rule that *e*

plus *s* in close syllable is close *e*, as he here gives open *e* in *θes-sɐ*.

The unaccented vowel in the final absolute is, says the author on page 157, the longest of the weak vowels, but he denies the prolongation of the final vowel, claiming that to be a popular pronunciation. He notes, however, that foreigners shorten this vowel too much. If that is the case, then these vowels are probably neither so short nor so obscure as represented. The length of the vowel in the final absolute in Castilian is so well recognized a fact that one may well ask whether the author is justified in shortening it to *ɐ*, *ə*, etc., in his "pronunciación correcta" if he really means that to be Castilian. Mention has already been made of the larger aspects of these analyses, *viz.*, as to synthetic influences.

The author's practical rule that Spanish vowels are always short, even with the limitations added as to relative length, do not seem to be in accord with the widely differing lengths that he assigns in hundredths of a second for vowels. These lengths vary from 4.5 to 20 hundredths of a second. One would suppose that limits much less considerable than these might still be sufficient to provide for regular long and short vowels.

In the last paragraph but one above, we have referred to the unaccented vowel in the final absolute. Mr. Navarro Tomás analyzes this vowel as what might be called a semi-obscure and relaxed vowel. He states: "Su duración iguala o supera, en general, á la de la vocal fuerte precedente." But how can these vowels, in this position, be so long if they are obscure? The fact is that they are not obscure. Proof of this is afforded by what the author states of the various vowels of this class in his descriptive analyses, *viz.*, that *ɐ*, *o*, *u*, *ə*, *i*, readily become clear vowels when lengthened, stressed, or pronounced carefully. But this unusual length (p. 157) given for an unstressed vowel is really proof that the analysis as given elsewhere (p. 40, 43, 46, etc.) is inaccurate. Furthermore, this throws together in the same category relaxed vowels varying in length from 4.5 to 10 or 15 hundredths of a second—according to his measurements.

No mention is made of quantity stress, a matter of considerable importance in Spanish.

The chapter on intonation is very interesting, and until further investigation may well be accepted as a contribution to Spanish phonetics. Although a few stress groups might be shorter, the divisions seem in general well made.

In conclusion, it seems to us that the author has made Spanish his basis rather than Castilian; that he tends in certain cases toward a symmetry in analysis which is hardly justified by the facts. Often, however, he seems rather to overlook the larger synthetic aspects of the phonetic material, and to tend in vowel analysis toward the traditional popular Spanish view that, if there is any variation in Spanish vowels, it is due to the following consonant. It is only just to state in this connection that the author in general properly emphasizes several of the important basic conditions of phonetic analysis.

It will be unnecessary to sum up all of our observations; suffice it to say that in view of the transcription chosen; the superabundance of, and hairsplitting varieties of *i* and *u*; the exaggerated and extended use of obscure vowels; and erroneous rules for the use of certain vowels, the *Manual* can hardly be called a successful fulfillment of the author's ambition, as stated in the Introduction, namely, to write a simple practical handbook of pronunciation.

As pointed out in the beginning, the book is by no means without value. It would indeed be unfair not to recognize the great difficulty of execution inherent in the task which the author set for himself. In general, therefore, it may be said that Mr. Navarro Tomás has made a very creditable beginning in the field of phonetics, and we wish him every success in this rich Spanish field, where there is room for hundreds of investigators instead of one or two.

MOLTON AVERY COLTON.

*U. S. Naval Academy.*

---

*A Catalogue of the Library of the late John Henry Wrenn.* Compiled by HAROLD B. WRENN. Edited by THOMAS J. WISE. Austin, University of Texas, 1920.

*The Wrenn Catalogue*, beautifully printed on Whatman hand-made paper, is at last out, in a limited edition of one hundred and twenty copies, a number of which have been presented to university libraries for the future use of scholars. Thomas J. Wise, bibliographer of Coleridge, Landor, Wordsworth, Tennyson, Browning and Swinburne, and officer of the English Bibliographical